



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PROHIBITION AND POLITICS—II

BY L. AMES BROWN

IN the present paper my purpose is to present data as to the steps by which the prohibition movement has been nationalized, and as to its political status, with the view of formulating some indications of the progress that may be expected for it in the immediate future. At the outset, we meet the curious anomaly of our politics that the success of the advocates of States' rights in forcing the Webb Interstate Liquor Shipment Law through Congress over the veto of President Taft paved the way for the agitation of the Hobson movement for national prohibition.

This law provides that the transportation of intoxicants from one State into another State, "which is intended by any person interested therein to be received, possessed, sold, or in any manner used, either in the original package or otherwise, in violation of any law of such State, Territory, or District of the United States, or place non-contiguous to but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, is hereby prohibited."

President Taft declared the enactment to be a clear violation of the Constitution, holding it "in substance and effect a delegation by Congress to the States of the power of regulating interstate commerce in liquors, which is vested exclusively in Congress." In his veto message, Mr. Taft said:

If Congress, however, may in addition entirely suspend the operation of the interstate-commerce clause upon a lawful subject of interstate commerce and turn the regulation of interstate commerce over to the States in respect to it, it is difficult to see how it may not suspend interstate commerce in respect to every subject of commerce wherever the police power of the State can be exercised to hinder or obstruct that commerce. I can not think that the framers of the Constitution, or that the people who adopted it, had in mind for a

moment that Congress could thus nullify the operation of a clause whose useful effect was deemed so important, and which in fact has contributed so much to the solidarity of the Nation and the prosperity that has followed unhampered, nation-wide trade.

Congress overruled Mr. Taft's veto by a vote of 244 to 95 in the House, and 63 to 21 in the Senate. The liquor interests made no effort to prevent the passage of the measure, being advised that it represented merely an effort to appease the temperance sentiment of the country through the passage of a "harmless" law, and there is no doubt that some members of the House voted for the measure because they believed it harmless, seeing an opportunity to make political friends of temperance workers without making any political enemies. Representative Webb, the chairman of the House Committee on Judiciary and the author of the law in question, in a recent communication to me regarding the measure, said:

This law, strictly speaking, is not a prohibition law, it is rather a local option measure which gives to the States the absolute right to control the troublesome liquor question for themselves. As to the constitutionality of the law, I feel quite secure in the belief that it will be upheld by unanimous court when the Supreme Court comes to pass upon it. I may be too sanguine in this matter, but my three years' study of this question brings me to that conclusion.

The Anti-Saloon League's campaign for national prohibition was launched formally at the Twenty-Year Jubilee Convention of the League held in Columbus, Ohio, November, 1913. This campaign resulted, in December, 1914, in a vote by the House of Representatives upon the Hobson resolution to submit a prohibition Constitutional amendment to a vote of the States. This test of strength was not of the prohibitionists' seeking, as is attested by an interview given out by Representative Hobson in the Fall of 1914, charging that the opponents of the resolution were forcing a vote in the hope of smothering it, and thus affecting the prohibition campaign unfavorably. It was a fact that Representative Underwood, of Alabama, the majority leader of the House, and at that time a candidate for the Senate in Alabama in opposition to Representative Hobson, was the prime mover in the plan for bringing out the Hobson resolution from the Judiciary Committee and providing for a vote under a special rule. President Wilson, in so far as he exerted any influence in the parliamentary

situation, upheld Mr. Underwood. A short time before the vote the President refused to sanction a well-worked-out plan of the House leaders to shelve the resolution. The President informed his friends in the House that he did not believe the Democratic Party ought to accept the responsibility of preventing a vote on a measure of such intense popular interest. It is true also that both sides to the contest recognized that the Hobson resolution would fail of passage. Indeed, the test of strength was regarded as important solely for its possible psychological effect upon the country. The issue thus joined eventuated disastrously for the opponents of prohibition, for the Hobson resolution received a vote four in excess of a majority of the voting membership.

Certain aspects of the vote on the Hobson resolution should be noted as having significance with reference to the future of the movement. For one thing, the suffrage movement and the Hobson movement found common ground in 106 Congressional districts despite the fundamental divergence, between the one which seeks to increase the rights of individuals, and the other which would deprive them of an established right. One hundred and six members who voted affirmatively on the Hobson resolution voted a few weeks later for the Mondell suffrage resolution. This was indubitable evidence that 106 Congressmen believed their districts favored both suffrage and prohibition, supporting the traditional claim of the temperance workers that the prohibition movement would be strengthened by equal suffrage as against the declarations of some anti-suffragists that women have not fought the liquor traffic in States where they have been given the vote.

The next step in the nationalization of the prohibition movement came in January, 1915, when the prohibitionists waged a strenuous and almost victorious fight in the Senate for the incorporation of a prohibition rider in the District of Columbia Appropriation Bill. An amendment to the District bill to foist prohibition upon the people of the District without a referendum was offered by Senator Morris Sheppard, of Texas. Insistence by the opposition that the Sheppard motion to suspend the rules and consider his rider be referred to the Committee on Rules produced the first test of strength. The vote was 37 ayes, 34 noes, and 25 not voting. The Rules Committee made a favorable report upon the Sheppard amendment, and the fight then narrowed down to

the consideration of a motion to suspend the rules. The prohibitionists contended that the rules could be suspended by a majority vote. The opposition held out successfully for a two-thirds vote.

The prohibitionists, with one or two exceptions, refused to listen to suggestions that the legislation be submitted to a vote of the District of Columbia, thus disregarding the principle of self-government which they had agitated so vigorously in local option campaigns. It is noteworthy that the Senators who are regarded as close friends of the Wilson Administration held out for a referendum, and I have good reasons for stating that if the District of Columbia Appropriation Bill had come to him embodying a provision for prohibition without a referendum, President Wilson would have vetoed it.

The movement for prohibition in the District of Columbia will probably be revived at the next session of Congress, with a promise of success. That the movement may succeed is to be attributed to the fact that a large proportion of Congressmen regard the District of Columbia as a little Poland, whereon it is good sport to try out reform legislation which may interest the people "back home." It is a fair but saddening commentary upon the ways of legislatures that the last Congress considered the District of Columbia a fit subject for experimental legislation, without regard for the sentiment of the people to be affected. The House of Representatives was eager for an opportunity to concur in the Senate amendment, had the Sheppard fight succeeded in the upper body. Among fair-minded people without the pale of political ambition, the Sheppard fight had an appreciable influence in favor of local self-government for the District of Columbia.

The prohibition forces of to-day are organized with a degree of efficiency attained by few movements in the history of the Republic. Their efficiency of organization prevents us effectually from drawing a parallel between the Dow movement and the Hobson movement. The power of that portion of public opinion which now supports the demand for national prohibition is exerted upon Congress and State political bodies and in elections through the Anti-Saloon League of America. The League organizes and manages every important prohibition fight made in the country, and maintains at Washington one of the most powerful lobbies

ever seen at the National Capital. It is known as the National Legislative Headquarters of the League, and is in charge of Rev. E. C. Dinwiddie, National Legislative Superintendent. It is a lobby clearly within the sense of the term accepted in modern American politics. Its representatives, backed by an organized influence of public opinion, are enabled to dictate the attitude of a considerable number of Congressmen on a pending question, with the result that Congressmen oftentimes are driven to vote against their own views and their own consciencies in favor of measures advocated by the lobby. Speaking of his views on excess of so-called reform legislation, President Taft made the following observations upon the most recent fight conducted by the prohibition lobby in the House of Representatives:

This excess of legislation I attribute to two causes. The first was the erroneous belief that any reform could be accomplished merely by legislation, and the second was that legislators were prone to enact laws not because they believed their enforcement would do any good, or because they had their enforcement in mind, but only because their votes would profit them politically. Due to this last cause, whenever a part of the electorate in a Congressional district, not a majority, but supposed to hold the balance of power, threaten to plump their votes for or against a Congressional candidate on a particular issue, and without regard to their own party affiliations, they were able to frighten legislators into the legislation which they as a minority group demanded. In this wise the amendment for national prohibition secured a majority of the members of the House of Representatives. Many members voted for it who are not really in favor of it, nor did a majority of their constituents demand it. Such members voted for it merely to secure the approval and support of a comparatively small element in the electorate, whose votes they feared might defeat them if they voted their own conviction.

Little needs to be added to President Taft's disapprobation of the working of the prohibition lobby. It is true, as he points out, that the Representatives of minorities in scores upon scores of Congressional districts were enabled by the compactness of their organization and the threat of their implacable opposition in the future, to induce Congressmen to yield their conscientious opposition to the Hobson resolution. The harmful effect of such a lobbying enterprise upon our system of government does not admit of controversy. It is inimical to the very spirit of our governmental institutions, in that it would remove the legislative power from Congress itself, in so far as the matter of pro-

hibition is concerned, and place this power in the hands of the Anti-Saloon League. A lobby always has been condemned by the American people. The very term "lobby" has been anathema in American politics. Until the appearance of Mr. Gompers and Mr. Dinwiddie, those who exerted "a concerted influence" upon Congress did their work secretly and under cover. The Anti-Saloon League has been utterly fearless in its operations, however, and has made no effort to cloak its activities in the corridors of the House of Representatives. The justification of the League leaders that their Congressional lobby is "seeking to put through Congress measures for the public good, touching the traffic in intoxicating liquors," does not seem to me to be adequate. The disapproval which the American people have maintained to all lobbying grew out of a more fundamental thought than could be involved in the character of the legislation sought. The essential factor in this disapproval was that a concerted effort was being made to substitute for the judgment of Congress the judgment of a certain element in the electorate.

The Anti-Saloon League nationalized the prohibition movement of to-day. It managed the fight for the enactment of the Webb Law in 1913. The managers of the League, and not Representative Hobson, of Alabama, furnished the real leadership of the fight for the Hobson resolution in 1915; indeed, Hobson was little more than a figurehead in the fight, the spokesman of the Anti-Saloon League leaders, who directed things from the cloak rooms. Not Hobson but Mr. Dinwiddie and his colleagues of the Anti-Saloon League leadership figuratively cracked the whip over the heads of the cravens and weaklings in the House, and brought to terms the men who shuddered at the threat of political opposition by the Anti-Saloon element, and of being branded with the stigma of the Whiskey Trust. The prohibition lobbyists in that fight gave cards and spades to the representatives of the liquor interests who had come to Washington. It was a sullen House of Representatives who voted by a majority of four to submit the Hobson resolution, a House of Representatives who acted under compulsion, but who, despite their sullenness, did not dare to assert their independence.

The Anti-Saloon League political leaders make no secret of their political activities. I quote the following from a let-

ter written me by General Superintendent P. A. Baker, in September, 1915:

While the League has a political department, it is absolutely omni-partisan. It seeks the nomination of men opposed to the liquor traffic on all party tickets for positions having to do with the enactment or the enforcement of laws touching the liquor traffic. Its appeal to those whom it can influence is—when such men are not nominated on all party tickets—to be large enough to vote for a good man on the opposite ticket rather than a bad man on their own. It has no alliance with any political party. It does not permit itself to be used in the interest of any candidate for any position that does not have to do with the drink traffic. Our legislative office at Washington may justly be called a lobby seeking to put through Congress measures for the public good touching the traffic in intoxicating liquors. It differs from other lobbies in the respect that it has no relation to personal gain or personal advancement. It is the Christian forces of the country mobilized and brought to bear in an organized way upon the Congress of the United States upon the one issue.

This powerful organization began its activities in 1893, having been founded upon a temperance organization local to Oberlin, Ohio. It began with local option fights in Ohio, and now has succeeded in mobilizing the prohibition forces of the country, and the composite influence of thirty-eight State organizations is exerted wherever the prohibition issue is involved in an election.

The League is well provided with funds. The income of the various State organizations, together with that of the national organization, was approximately \$1,500,000 last year. Whence came these large war funds is more or less a mystery. It has been charged by opponents that they represent "Rockefeller money" and contributions of other big interests. Mr. Carnegie as well as Mr. Rockefeller have been mentioned at times as heavy contributors.

One of the chief sources of power of the League is the remarkable efficiency it has displayed in paying off old political scores. The implacability of the organization's enmity against men who have thwarted its plans is Jesuitical, and the typical seeker after office would rather incur the opposition of any other organization. The leaders of the prohibition movement have thought it worth while in many cases to make great sacrifices of energy and money to defeat candidates who had opposed them in earlier parts of their careers. A conspicuous instance of this sort was the defeat

of Myron T. Herrick for a second term as Governor of Ohio. In 1904, by threatening to exercise his veto power, Governor Herrick succeeded in having the Brannock Local Option Bill amended by the Ohio Legislature to an extent which the Anti-Saloon League managers considered rendered the measure worthless. Herrick was elected for his first term by a majority of 113,000. The Republican Party had carried the State in 1904 by more than 255,000. In 1905 the Republican State ticket was elected by normal majorities with the exception of Governor Herrick, who, to quote from an Anti-Saloon League publication, "went down to defeat before an avalanche of Christian protest, which buried him under a majority of 44,000 strong."

The black list of the League has been a growing one in the past few years. It is published in the annual Year Book, and now includes every member of the House or Senate, who in 1914 voted against the Webb measure or the motion to override the veto of President Taft; every member who voted against the Hobson resolution in 1914; and every member of the Senate who did not follow the leadership of Senator Sheppard, of Texas, in his effort to foist prohibition upon the people of the District of Columbia.

Serious charges of misrepresentation and actual dishonesty in State campaigns have been made against the prohibitionists by the National Retail Liquor Dealers' Association. Charges are made that petitions having faked signatures have been submitted to State legislatures, and that subterfuges have been resorted to in order to secure signatures to these petitions. It is probable, however, that these incidents, if they really are authentic, are isolated, and the chief harm done by the propaganda is in the circulation of literature, such as Congressman Hobson's speech in Congress a year ago, containing such unverified statements as the announcement that 730,000 people die annually from alcoholism, an utterance which Senator John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, undoubtedly had in mind when he observed in one of the Senate debates:

"Not long ago I checked up the utterances of a very distinguished prohibitionist, and he mentioned the fact that a certain number of people in America went to their graves each year from the liquor habit. It struck me as an enormous number of people, and I thought maybe I had better look into it, and I found that alcohol by his account had sent

to their graves in America about 100,000 more people than had in that year died in all America."

With their political plans already well defined, the prohibitionists are enabled to devote their energies to activities within the various political parties in the period when the parties themselves have not settled down to the serious work of the pre-convention campaigns. Three distinct purposes have been fixed upon by the prohibition managers. First, the fight for the adoption of the Hobson resolution will be renewed at the next session of Congress convening December 1st, 1915. Second, an effort will be made to secure the nomination of Presidential candidates favorable to the Hobson resolution by the Democratic and Republican parties, and to secure platform declarations favoring the submission of the issue to a vote of the States from the national conventions of the two parties. Third, the prohibitionists will take a vigorous part in practically all of the Congressional elections in 1916, in the hope of bringing about the election of a Congress so strongly in favor of submitting the prohibition issue to the States that, regardless of the attitude of the next President, it will be impossible to prevent the passage of the Hobson resolution after March 4th, 1917.

It is to be expected that the Anti-Saloon League's chosen successor to Representative Hobson, as its spokesman in the House of Representatives, will reintroduce the Hobson resolution a few days after the reconvening of the next session. The measure will be referred to the Judiciary Committee, of which Representative Webb, of North Carolina, author of the Interstate Liquor Shipment Law, is chairman. The committee will give a favorable report on the resolution, and it then will be necessary to seek a special rule from the Committee on Rules to allow its early consideration in the House. Representative Henry, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Rules, is opposed to the resolution, having decried the agitation of the issue in recent campaign speeches, but his opposition will not suffice to prevent the passage of a rule when the prohibitionists make a determined fight for it. The prohibitionists will insist upon this test of strength in the House for the sake of the moral effect of a repetition of the majority vote secured a year ago. They are hopeful that even a larger vote may be secured, but the most optimistic do not expect the two-thirds vote, which would be necessary

for the submission of a Constitutional amendment to the States.

Frank avowals have been made by the prohibitionists of their intention to exert their full influence in the pre-convention and post-convention stages of the next national campaign. The first pronouncement of this intention was made by Representative Hobson in the debate on the Hobson resolution, December, 1914, when he said:

I here announce to you that the great temperance and prohibition forces of this whole nation will make this question the paramount issue in 1916 not only to gain a two-thirds majority in the two houses of Congress, but to have an Administration that neither in the open nor under cover will fight this reform.

The suspicion that Hobson's utterance was designed to be a warning to President Wilson as to the menace of prohibition opposition to his renomination and re-election was confirmed in a statement issued by the national officers of the Anti-Saloon League, General Superintendent Baker and Legislative Superintendent Dinwiddie, after the last national convention of the League last Spring. This was the statement which the League issued from Washington:

Just at this time, when the party leaders are looking for available candidates for the Presidency next year, it will be well if they will carefully consider one or two things. The united prohibition forces of the country will oppose a candidacy of any man who voted against the Webb-Kenyon interstate liquor shipment law or voted against the resolution to submit the national prohibition amendment to the States, or who advocates only the States rights policy of dealing with the liquor traffic.

This statement served notice that the Anti-Saloon League will oppose the renomination of President Wilson by the Democratic Party, and the nomination of Senator Root, who voted against the Webb bill by the Republican Party; while it will not oppose the candidacy of Senator Borah, Senator Burton, and Senator Cummins, who voted for the Webb bill in the Senate, and of Senator Weeks, who voted for the measure in the House.

Turn now to a consideration of certain important factors in the political situation which may be expected to affect the future of the prohibitionists' plans. Political issues never can be separated from political personalities. The primary consideration in the formulation of a judgment as to the political prospects of the prohibition movement in advance

of the next political campaign should be the known attitude of the outstanding leaders of the people. Interest centers first in President Wilson, who believes that prohibition, like suffrage, is an issue for the States and not the nation. His friends are confident that he will oppose the incorporation of a prohibition plank in the platform on which he is to run. The President stated his convictions for the benefit of the Maine voters in the 1912 campaign in the following letter:

I am in favor of local option. I am a thorough believer in local self-government and believe that every self-governing community which constitutes a social unit should have the right to control the regulation or withholding of licenses. But the questions involved are social and moral and are not susceptible of being made parts of a party programme.

This letter is still furnished to the newspaper correspondents by the White House whenever an expression of the President's views on prohibition is sought.

Ex-Secretary of State Bryan, who referred to the States' rights articles as "perishable tommyrot," a short time after the House debates in which President Wilson's letter advocating the local self-government principle was quoted, has advised against the agitation of the prohibition issue in the next national campaign. He said in an interview at Atlanta early in October that the issue would have to be dealt with "when the time is ripe," but that he did not think the next campaign the proper time. Mr. Bryan is an open advocate of nation-wide prohibition, and he has in frequent statements advised the Democratic Party to take the "moral" side of the issue in every State where it is raised. His view that it will not be the part of strategic wisdom for the prohibitionists to bring the liquor issue to the fore in the next campaign is made in the following excerpt from a recent statement:

"I hope that national prohibition will not be an issue in the campaign of 1916. I prefer to see that campaign fought out on the economic issues which divide the two leading parties. The Democratic Party has made a splendid record in matters of legislation and administration, and its defeat might result in the undoing of some of the things that have been accomplished."

Mr. Bryan's intimation that the Democratic Party would face defeat if prohibition were the dominating issue in the next national campaign is exceedingly interesting. Presum-

ably he recalled the recent fights in Maine and Ohio, in which the Democratic Party opposed prohibition, and in which he was called upon to enter the campaign bespeaking the election of "wet" candidates.

Colonel Roosevelt, like Secretary Bryan, is known to view the political possibilities of the prohibition issue with interest, and at times with serious thoughts of appropriating its advantages, as he did with the suffrage issue in the last campaign. Mr. Roosevelt, while he has never come out for prohibition, made a speech at Columbus, Ohio, last Fall in which he charged that both the old parties in Ohio were in league with the liquor interests, and made a vigorous attack upon the liquor interests for their participation in the Ohio campaign. He spoke from the same platform with James R. Garfield, the Progressive Party's candidate for governor, and his speech, while not in open advocacy of the prohibition amendment supported by the Progressive Party candidate, was distinctly favorable to the "dry" cause.

Ex-President Taft, like President Wilson, believes that the injection of the prohibition issue into national politics would be an evil. He summarized recent statements in regard to prohibition in the following excerpt from a letter to a friend:

I said that it would destroy the balance of powers between the central Government and the State Governments; that it was a direct blow at local self-government, and at the integrity of our Federal system which depended on preserving the control by the States of parochial and local matters; a local matter, because opinions with reference to how it should be treated varied with every community. Secondly, it was dangerous because the exercise of jurisdiction to prohibit the liquor traffic would call for a horde of Federal officials in addition to the hundreds of thousands now representing the United States Government, and would give to an unscrupulous manipulator in national politics, with Federal authority, a power that would be dangerous to the republic whenever candidates were to be selected by his party, or whenever an election was to be had.

In every national campaign there are at least three elements in the electorate, as differentiated from the inherent strength of the parties themselves, that make their influence felt on one side or the other. The position of organized labor is seldom open to question, and plays an important part in the result of every campaign. The "Catholic vote" is a phrase recognized as having a definite meaning in the vocabulary of practical politics. A third element is the capitalistic

element. Capital has its own viewpoint on matters of national politics, and like that of labor its influence is felt in the councils of the political managers, as well as in national campaigns. It is practicable to study the positions of these three elements with respect to prohibition, and from the information adduced to throw some light upon the political prospects of the movement.

A highly important factor in the spread of temperance sentiment in the United States is what has come to be designated as "industrial prohibition." It is a fact that many of the big industrial leaders, apart from all considerations of sentiment, and I might also say without reference to humanitarian motives, have permitted themselves to be converted to the prohibition cause as a result of arguments that have been urged upon them regarding the effect of alcohol as affecting the matters of profit and loss. I do not wish to convey the impression that prohibition is a movement of the big interests to swell their money bags, but merely to direct attention to the fact that some industrial capitalists are disposed to view the movement with more or less favor.

The attitude of organized labor to the prohibition movement is as clearly defined as its attitude on other important national issues. President Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, set forth this attitude in these words:

As you know, the constitution of the American Federation of Labor names the Prohibition Party as among those whose party politics shall have no place in the conventions of our organization. Despite this, the leaders of organized labor have their personal opinions, and strong ones at that. The consensus of opinion among the leaders of organized labor is anti-prohibition. We are opposed to the legal prohibition of drinking because we do not want the Government to say to us, "You shall not drink." We do not believe that this is the right way, or even a practical way, in which temperance reform shall be brought about. No one is more firmly convinced of the necessity for temperance as a requisite of efficiency than workingmen, but they are opposed to the prohibition movement because it has been such a stupendous failure everywhere that it has been tried. I have done a great deal of traveling in the United States, as was necessary in the performance of my duties as President of the American Federation of Labor, and I say, without reservation, that I have seen more real drunkenness in Prohibition States than I have seen anywhere else in the world, not excepting the centers of population in Europe. I saw more drunkenness in the 1906 campaign against Congressman Littlefield in Maine, a Pro-

hibition State, than I have seen in any political fight in which I was engaged.

An outstanding accomplishment of the prohibition laws has been that the people in the sections where they were operative were prevented from acquiring the taste for the lighter beverages, such as beer, in preference to whiskies. One of the wholesome signs in the modern industrial life of the country has been the surprising extent to which light beer has displaced the more ardent beverages. The people in the Prohibition States would have been much better off if their laws had not prevented them from keeping abreast of this national tendency.

The extent of the activities of the labor organizations in opposition to the fight for national prohibition in the next Congress is yet to be determined. Political students would welcome eagerly the news that the labor lobby and the prohibition lobby are to lock horns on this issue. Such a contest would dispel the uncertainty now existing as to which is the stronger lobby in the country.

Cardinal Gibbons, the most influential prelate of the Catholic Church in the United States, believes with President Wilson that the liquor issue should be dealt with in accordance with the principles of local self-government. He is convinced that local prohibition is at times desirable, and in the local option fights in Saint Mary's and Calvert counties, Maryland, he authorized Catholic clergymen to exert their influence for the adoption of the prohibition law, and backed up the clergy with a strong letter. It is certain, however, that Cardinal Gibbons never will seek to exert the influence of the Catholic Church in favor of nation-wide prohibition, and that American Catholics in so far as they are influenced by the cardinal will oppose the movement.

There can be little question of the opposition of the Catholics generally to the prohibition movement so long as Catholic publications as orthodox and as influential as the *Ecclesiastical Review* feature such articles as "An Aspect of Prohibition," by Rev. Lucian Johnston, in the October issue. This very vigorous article contained the following striking sentences:

"Certainly it (prohibition) is in spirit utterly alien to the genius of Catholicity. . . . Prohibition as a principle is not congenial to the genius of Catholicity. . . . I further believe that the present wave of prohibition sweeping our country is very largely an aspect of Protestantism, a

sort of Protestant revival with all the earmarks of a movement of a sect."

The writer, who is a priest of Baltimore, the residence of Cardinal Gibbons, characterizes the prohibition movement as "essentially emotionalism unregulated by reason."

"Prohibition," he adds, "is full of possibilities far more dangerous than drunkenness. Basically, it is Socialistic. Practically, it is part and parcel of that practical Socialism that is ever more and more strangling the individual."

The writer beseeches his fellow priests that they join him in fighting drunkenness, "with temperance, a knowledge of psychology, a saving sense of humor, with love and pity for frailty and sympathy for human need of pleasure."

A survey of the political horizon indicates, it would seem, that the Hobson movement does not now possess the political resources necessary to the immediate fulfillment of its plans. The outstanding leaders of the political parties are almost unanimously against making prohibition a national issue as the Anti-Saloon League desires. The Catholic Church is not ready to throw its influence behind the movement, and the tremendous power of organized labor is openly directed against it. The capitalistic influence, while giving the prohibition movement some support in State fights, has not yielded to the Hobson propaganda. Consider these facts in the light of the statement of President Taft that the influence of the prohibitionists upon members of Congress is the influence of compact minorities in Congressional districts, and the conclusion is inescapable that the prohibitionists are in such minority in the country as a whole that, however compactly they may be organized, they are not in a position to predict success for years to come.

L. AMES BROWN.